

Symmetry-projected Hartree-Fock-Bogoliubov Equations

Javid A. Sheikh ^a, Peter Ring ^a

^a*Physik-Department, Technische Universität München, D-85747 Garching, Germany*

Abstract

Symmetry-projected Hartree-Fock-Bogoliubov (HFB) equations are derived using the variational ansatz for the generalized one-body density-matrix in the Valatin form. It is shown that the projected-energy functional can be completely expressed in terms of the HFB density-matrix and the pairing-tensor. The variation of this projected-energy is shown to result in HFB equations with modified expressions for the pairing-potential Δ and the Hartree-Fock field Γ . The expressions for these quantities are explicitly derived for the case of particle number-projection. The numerical applicability of this projection method is studied in an exactly soluble model of a deformed single-j shell.

1 Introduction

The concept of spontaneous symmetry breaking in mean-field theories has played a central role in our understanding of many-body problems [1]. The exact solution of a quantum mechanical many-body problem is impossible except for a few-body system and it is therefore necessary to adopt approximate methods. The most popular of these methods has been mean-field theory based on effective forces. The basic idea of the mean-field approach is to approximate the "unknown" many-body wavefunction by a Slater-determinant of single-particle or quasiparticle configurations. In this way the many-body problem is reduced to an effective one-body problem. In other words, the system of interacting particles is transformed to a system of non-interacting particles or quasiparticles. The effective one-body potential is obtained from the many-body Hamiltonian by using the Hartree-Fock (HF) or Hartree-Fock-Bogoliubov (HFB) approaches [2]. The HF method has first been introduced to solve the atomic many-body problem and it was shown that the many-electron problem can be reduced to one-electron problem with an effective potential which is determined by the interactions among all the electrons. This method

has been successfully applied to the nuclear many-body problem, although at first sight it appears conceptually contradictory to use a mean-field concept to a strongly interacting system. It was established later [3] that the Pauli-exclusion principle favours the description of the nuclear many-body problem in terms of the mean-field concept based on effective interactions.

The HF approximation describes the long-range part, referred to as the particle-hole ($p-h$) channel, of the effective interaction and, indeed, is quite appropriate for the atomic many-body problem. However, for the nuclear many-body problem it can only be used in closed shell configurations. For open shells, strong short-range pairing-correlations in the particle-particle ($p-p$) channel need to be considered. In order to treat the $p-p$ channel, the Bardeen-Cooper-Schrieffer (BCS) approximation [4], originally introduced to explain superconductivity in metals, has been applied to the nuclear problem with remarkable success [5,6]. For a complete description, both $p-p$ and $p-h$ channels need to be considered in a self-consistent manner. This is achieved in the generalised Hartree-Fock-Bogoliubov formalism [7].

It is an essential feature of mean-field theories that they can violate symmetries, i.e. the approximate product wavefunctions does not obey the same symmetries as the underlying two-body Hamiltonian. The broken symmetries, for instance, include translational symmetry, rotational symmetry, and the gauge symmetries connected with the particle numbers. Since the exact solution of the many-body Schrödinger equation obeys these symmetries being eigen-function of a complete set of generators of the corresponding symmetry group, the violation of symmetries in the first place is a very undesirable feature. However, the concept of symmetry violation allows to take into account correlations in a very simplified form by employing product states which are connected with phase-transitions and provide a relatively easy understanding of very complicated phenomena. Nevertheless, in systems with finite particle number, such as atomic nuclei these phase-transitions are never sharp and are smeared out by fluctuations. It is one of the disadvantages of the mean-field approximation that it leads to sharp phase-transitions even in finite systems, where the exact solution which takes into account fluctuations beyond the mean-field shows only a smooth transition between the two phases.

In order to have a better description of finite systems in the vicinity of phase-transitions, it is necessary to include fluctuations. One very powerful way to consider such fluctuations is through the restoration of the broken symmetries by using the projection methods [8].

There exists a vast amount of literature on such projection methods at zero temperature (see, for instance, Ref. [2]) and at finite temperatures (see, for instance, Ref. [9]). Since mean-field theories are variational theories, one can carry out the projection before or after the variation. It has turned out that

variation after projection (VAP) [10] is the appropriate tool that fulfills the variational principle and provides a self-consistent description of fluctuations going beyond mean-field.

Although, the method of variation after projection has been known since more than thirty-years, the numerical solution of the corresponding variational equations is relatively complicated. Therefore, a fully self-consistent variation after exact projection has been carried out so far only in a limited number of cases. Most of such calculations have been restricted to the variation with respect to a few order parameters. Applications with variation after exact projection have been restricted to light nuclei [11] or to the case of violation of particle number in BCS-theory (see, for instance, FBCS in Ref. [12]). Exact projection within full HFB-theory is possible by a search of the minimum in the projected-energy surface by gradient methods [13]. However these methods are numerically very complicated. So far they have been applied only to the case of number-projection in restricted spaces and for separable-forces [14]. In most of the applications, where number-projection is necessary, the approximate method of Lipkin and Nogami is used, which is, in fact, only an approximation and violates the variational principle [15].

The solution of the unprojected variational problem can be represented as a non-linear diagonalization problem (HF- or HFB-equations). This allows an iterative solution by the application of very fast numerical techniques. So far the projected variational problem has not been written as a diagonalization problem. In this work we derive for the first time a set of symmetry-projected HFB equations. They have same form as in the unprojected case and the only thing which differs is that in the case of projection the expressions for the Hartree-Fock potential and the pairing-field are more involved. This allows to modify the existing codes of unprojected solutions of the HFB-equations without much difficulty.

The manuscript is organised as follows: In section 2, some basic HFB relations are presented. The projected HFB energy is expressed in terms of the norm- and the Hamiltonian-overlaps in section 3 and it is shown in section 4 that these overlaps are entirely expressible in terms of the density-matrix ρ and the pairing-tensor κ . In section 5, it is shown that the variation of an arbitrary real energy functional, which can be completely written in terms of the density-matrix and the pairing-tensor, results in HFB equations of the conventional form. The explicit expressions of the projected HFB fields are derived for the case of particle-number projection in section 6. In section 7, it is shown that the expression for the pairing-field reduces to the familiar form of FBCS in the canonical representation. A model study is presented in section 8 and finally the present work is summarised in section 9.

2 Basic HFB-Formulae

In second quantization, the many-body Hamiltonian of a fermion system is usually expressed in terms of a set of annihilation and creation operators $(c, c^\dagger) = (c_1, \dots, c_M; c_1^\dagger, \dots, c_M^\dagger)$:

$$H = \sum_{n_1 n_2} e_{n_1 n_2} c_{n_1}^\dagger c_{n_2} + \frac{1}{4} \sum_{n_1 n_2 n_3 n_4} \bar{v}_{n_1 n_2 n_3 n_4} c_{n_1}^\dagger c_{n_2}^\dagger c_{n_4} c_{n_3}, \quad (1)$$

where the anti-symmetrized two-body matrix-element is defined by

$$\bar{v}_{n_1 n_2 n_3 n_4} = \langle n_1 n_2 | V | n_3 n_4 - n_4 n_3 \rangle. \quad (2)$$

The operators annihilate the bare fermion vacuum

$$c_n | - \rangle = 0 \quad (3)$$

for all n and provide a basis in the present analysis.

In the next step, a set of quasiparticle operators $(\alpha, \alpha^\dagger) = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_M; \alpha_1^\dagger, \dots, \alpha_M^\dagger)$ is introduced, which are connected to the original particle operators by a linear transformation

$$\alpha_k = \sum_n (U_{nk}^* c_n + V_{nk}^* c_n^\dagger) \quad (4)$$

$$\alpha_k^\dagger = \sum_n (V_{nk} c_n + U_{nk} c_n^\dagger). \quad (5)$$

This can be written in matrix form as

$$\begin{pmatrix} \alpha \\ \alpha^\dagger \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} U^\dagger & V^\dagger \\ V^T & U^T \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} c \\ c^\dagger \end{pmatrix} = \mathcal{W}^\dagger \begin{pmatrix} c \\ c^\dagger \end{pmatrix}. \quad (6)$$

Quasiparticle operators have to satisfy the same fermion commutation relations as the original operators. Therefore, the transformation matrix is required to be unitary

$$\mathcal{W}^\dagger \mathcal{W} = \mathcal{W} \mathcal{W}^\dagger = I, \quad (7)$$

which leads to following relations among the coefficients U_{nk} and V_{nk}

$$U^\dagger U + V^\dagger V = I, \quad UU^\dagger + V^* V^T = I, \quad (8)$$

$$U^T V + V^T U = 0, \quad UV^\dagger + V^* U^T = 0. \quad (9)$$

The quasiparticle operators annihilate the quasiparticle vacuum $|\Phi\rangle$, defined by

$$\alpha_k |\Phi\rangle = 0, \quad (10)$$

for all k . In mean-field theory, it represents an approximation to the ground-state of the system and turns out to be a generalized Slater-determinant [2]. Since the quasiparticle transformation mixes creation and annihilation operators, $|\Phi\rangle$ does not correspond to a wavefunction with good particle-number. We therefore have two types of densities, the normal density ρ , and the pairing-tensor κ , defined as

$$\rho_{nn'} = \langle \Phi | c_{n'}^\dagger c_n | \Phi \rangle, \quad \kappa_{nn'} = \langle \Phi | c_{n'} c_n | \Phi \rangle. \quad (11)$$

These can be expressed in terms of the HFB coefficients as

$$\rho = V^* V^T, \quad \kappa = V^* U^T = -UV^\dagger. \quad (12)$$

It can be immediately seen that ρ is Hermitian and κ is antisymmetric, i.e.

$$\rho^\dagger = \rho, \quad \kappa^T = -\kappa. \quad (13)$$

Using the unitarity relations (7), it can be also shown that ρ and κ satisfy

$$\rho - \rho^2 = -\kappa \kappa^*, \quad \rho \kappa = \kappa \rho^*. \quad (14)$$

With these basic relations for ρ and κ , the generalized density-matrix in the Valatin form [16] is defined as

$$\mathcal{R} = \begin{pmatrix} \rho & \kappa \\ -\kappa^* & -\sigma^* \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \rho & \kappa \\ -\kappa^* & 1 - \rho^* \end{pmatrix} = \mathcal{W} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \mathcal{W}^\dagger, \quad (15)$$

which satisfies,

$$\mathcal{R}^2 = \mathcal{R}. \quad (16)$$

It turns out that there is a one-to-one correspondence between the HFB-wavefunction $|\Phi\rangle$ and the generalized density-matrix $\mathcal{R}$, and that the quasiparticle transformation $\mathcal{W}$ diagonalizes this matrix. Using Thouless theorem

and restricting the following considerations to the case of even number-parity, we can express $|\Phi\rangle$ in terms of the operators $(c, c^\dagger)$ as

$$|\Phi\rangle = \mathcal{N} e^{\hat{Z}} |-\rangle, \quad (17)$$

with

$$\hat{Z} = \sum_{n < n'} Z_{nn'} c_n^\dagger c_{n'}^\dagger, \quad (18)$$

where the matrix Z is given by

$$Z = V^* U^{*-1} = -\rho \kappa^{*-1}. \quad (19)$$

$\mathcal{N}$ is a normalization factor

$$\mathcal{N} = \sqrt{|\det U|} = \det(1 - Z^* Z)^{-\frac{1}{4}}. \quad (20)$$

3 The Projected-Energy

In this section, we express the projected-energy in terms of the Hamiltonian- and the norm-overlaps. Restricting ourselves in this work to abelian symmetry groups, the projection-operator is defined as

$$P^I = \int dg d^I(g) \hat{R}(g), \quad (21)$$

where the integral runs over all elements g of the symmetry group. In the case of number-projection $g = \phi$ is the gauge-angle, $I = N$ is the particle-number and

$$\hat{R}(\phi) = e^{i\phi\hat{N}}, \quad d^N(\phi) = \frac{1}{2\pi} e^{-i\phi N}. \quad (22)$$

For one-dimensional angular-momentum projection of an axially-symmetric nucleus, $g = \beta$ is the Euler-angle, I is the angular momentum and

$$\hat{R}(\beta) = e^{i\beta\hat{J}_y}, \quad d^I(\beta) = \frac{2I+1}{8\pi^2} d_{00}^I(\beta). \quad (23)$$

In the case of K -projection in triaxial nuclei, i.e. projection onto a good angular momentum component along the z -axis $g = \gamma$ is the azimuth angle around

the z -axis, $I = K$ and

$$\hat{R}(\gamma) = e^{i\gamma\hat{J}_z}, \quad d^K(\gamma) = \frac{1}{2\pi} e^{-i\gamma K}. \quad (24)$$

Assuming that the Hamiltonian H commutes with the symmetry operator $\hat{R}(g)$, the projected-energy is given by

$$E^I = \frac{\langle \Phi | H P^I | \Phi \rangle}{\langle \Phi | P^I | \Phi \rangle} = \frac{\int dg d^I(g) \langle \Phi | H \hat{R}(g) | \Phi \rangle}{\int dg d^I(g) \langle \Phi | \hat{R}(g) | \Phi \rangle}. \quad (25)$$

In order to simplify the notation, we introduce the rotated Slater-determinants,

$$|g\rangle = \frac{\hat{R}(g)|\Phi\rangle}{\langle \Phi | \hat{R}(g) | \Phi \rangle}, \quad \text{with } |0\rangle = |\Phi\rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \langle 0 | g \rangle = 1, \quad (26)$$

and the coefficients

$$x(g) = d^I(g) \langle \Phi | \hat{R}(g) | \Phi \rangle, \quad (27)$$

and

$$y(g) = \frac{x(g)}{\int dg x(g)}, \quad \text{with} \quad \int dg y(g) = 1. \quad (28)$$

These have the property

$$x(-g) = x^*(g), \quad y(-g) = y^*(g). \quad (29)$$

Here $(-g)$ labels the inverse rotation $\hat{R}(-g) = \hat{R}^\dagger(g)$. For the projected energy we then find

$$E^I = \frac{\langle \Phi | H P^I | \Phi \rangle}{\langle \Phi | P^I | \Phi \rangle} = \frac{\int dg x(g) \langle 0 | H | g \rangle}{\int dg x(g)} = \int dg y(g) \langle 0 | H | g \rangle. \quad (30)$$

The overlap functions $\langle \Phi | \hat{R}(g) | \Phi \rangle$ and $\langle 0 | H | g \rangle$ are evaluated in the following section.

4 The Overlap-Integrals

It will be shown in this section that the overlaps for the norm $\langle \Phi | \hat{R}(g) | \Phi \rangle$ and the Hamiltonian $\langle 0 | H | g \rangle$ can be completely expressed in terms of ρ and κ defined in Eq. (11). For this purpose, we use the generalized Wick theorem as derived by Onishi (for details see Ref. [2]), which allows us to express overlaps in terms the HFB coefficients (U, V) and (U_g, V_g) corresponding to the Slater determinants $|0\rangle = |\Phi\rangle$ and $|g\rangle \sim \hat{R}(g)|\Phi\rangle$, respectively. The HFB-coefficients (U_g, V_g) of the wavefunction $|g\rangle$ are given by

$$U_g = D_g U, \quad V_g = D_g^* V, \quad (31)$$

where the matrix D_g is the representation of the rotation operator $\hat{R}(g)$ in the single-particle space characterized by the basis states $|n\rangle = a_n^\dagger |-\rangle$

$$(D_g)_{nn'} = \langle n | \hat{R}(g) | n' \rangle. \quad (32)$$

This means

$$\mathcal{W}_g = \mathcal{D}_g \mathcal{W}, \quad \text{with} \quad \mathcal{D}_g = \begin{pmatrix} D_g & 0 \\ 0 & D_g^* \end{pmatrix}. \quad (33)$$

In order to derive the norm-overlap, we start from the representation (17) for the HFB-wave-functions and find

$$\langle \Phi | \hat{R}(g) | \Phi \rangle = |\det U| \langle - | e^{\hat{Z}^\dagger} e^{\hat{Z}_g} | - \rangle \quad \text{with} \quad Z_g = V_g^* U_g^{*-1}. \quad (34)$$

We introduce the function

$$G_g(\lambda) = \langle - | e^{\hat{Z}^\dagger} e^{\lambda \hat{Z}_g} | - \rangle, \quad (35)$$

which obeys the differential equation

$$\frac{d}{d\lambda} G_g(\lambda) = \frac{1}{2} G_g(\lambda) \text{Tr} \ln(1 - \lambda Z^* Z_g). \quad (36)$$

Integrating from $\lambda = 0$ to $\lambda = 1$ we find

$$G_g(\lambda) = e^{\frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \ln(1 - \lambda Z^* Z_g)} = \pm \sqrt{\det(1 - \lambda Z^* Z_g)}. \quad (37)$$

The phase of the overlap integral remains open in this derivation, because the logarithm is a multivalued function determined only up to multiples of $2\pi i$. Therefore, we are left with a phase problem. In principle, this phase is well defined. Several methods have been proposed in the literature [17,18] to determine the phase in an arbitrary case. However, they appear complicated and are connected with considerable numerical effort.

Using the expression for $G_g(1)$ in (34), we obtain the norm-overlap

$$\langle \Phi | \hat{R}(g) | \Phi \rangle = |\det U| G_g(1) = \pm \sqrt{\frac{\det(1 - Z^* Z_g)}{\det(1 - Z^* Z)}} = \pm \sqrt{\det D_g} \sqrt{\det(N_g)} \quad (38)$$

with the matrix N_g defined as

$$N_g = U^T U_g^* + V^T V_g^* = U^T D_g^* U^* + V^T D_g V^*, \quad (39)$$

For the Hamiltonian-overlap functions, $\langle 0 | H | g \rangle$, we again use the generalized Wick theorem of Onishi, which allows us to express matrix elements of arbitrary operators between the brackets $\langle 0 |$ and $| g \rangle$ for Slater-determinants $| g \rangle$ (normalized by $\langle 0 | g \rangle = 1$) in terms of the generalized densities. The Hamiltonian overlap has three parts

$$\langle 0 | H | g \rangle = H(g) = H_{sp}(g) + H_{ph}(g) + H_{pp}(g), \quad (40)$$

$$= \sum_{n_1 n_2} e_{n_1 n_2} \langle 0 | c_{n_1}^\dagger c_{n_2} | g \rangle \quad (41)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n_1 n_2 n_3 n_4} \bar{v}_{n_1 n_2 n_3 n_4} \langle 0 | c_{n_1}^\dagger c_{n_3} | g \rangle \langle 0 | c_{n_2}^\dagger c_{n_4} | g \rangle \quad (42)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{4} \sum_{n_1 n_2 n_3 n_4} \bar{v}_{n_1 n_2 n_3 n_4} \langle 0 | c_{n_1}^\dagger c_{n_2}^\dagger | g \rangle \langle 0 | c_{n_4} c_{n_3} | g \rangle, \quad (43)$$

with

$$H_{sp}(g) = \sum_{n_1 n_2} e_{n_1 n_2} \rho_{n_2 n_1}(g) = \text{Tr}(e \rho(g)), \quad (44)$$

$$H_{ph}(g) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n_1 n_2 n_3 n_4} \bar{v}_{n_1 n_2 n_3 n_4} \rho_{n_3 n_1}(g) \rho_{n_4 n_2}(g) = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\Gamma(g) \rho(g)), \quad (45)$$

$$H_{pp}(g) = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{n_1 n_2 n_3 n_4} \bar{v}_{n_1 n_2 n_3 n_4} \bar{\kappa}_{n_1 n_2}^*(g) \kappa_{n_3 n_4}(g), \quad (46)$$

$$= -\frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\Delta(g) \bar{\kappa}^*(g)) = -\frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\bar{\Delta}^*(g) \kappa(g)), \quad (47)$$

where we have introduced the fields

$$\Gamma_{n_1 n_3}(g) = \sum_{n_2 n_4} \bar{v}_{n_1 n_2 n_3 n_4} \rho_{n_4 n_2}(g), \quad (48)$$

$$\Delta_{n_1 n_2}(g) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n_3 n_4} \bar{v}_{n_1 n_2 n_3 n_4} \kappa_{n_3 n_4}(g), \quad (49)$$

$$\bar{\Delta}_{n_1 n_2}^*(g) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n_3 n_4} \bar{\kappa}_{n_3 n_4}^*(g) \bar{v}_{n_3 n_4 n_1 n_2}, \quad (50)$$

$$\bar{\Delta}_{n_1 n_2}(g) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n_3 n_4} \bar{v}_{n_1 n_2 n_3 n_4} \bar{\kappa}_{n_3 n_4}(g). \quad (51)$$

The generalized densities are given by

$$\rho_{nn'}(g) = \langle 0 | c_{n'}^\dagger c_n | g \rangle = \left(V_g^* N_g^{-1} V^T \right)_{nn'}, \quad (52)$$

$$\kappa_{nn'}(g) = \langle 0 | c_{n'} c_n | g \rangle = \left(V_g^* N_g^{-1} U^T \right)_{nn'}, \quad (53)$$

$$-\bar{\kappa}_{nn'}^*(g) = \langle 0 | c_{n'}^\dagger c_n^\dagger | g \rangle = \left(U_g^* N_g^{-1} V^T \right)_{nn'}, \quad (54)$$

$$-\sigma_{nn'}^*(g) = \langle 0 | c_{n'} c_n^\dagger | g \rangle = \left(U_g^* N_g^{-1} U^T \right)_{nn'}. \quad (55)$$

The matrices $\kappa(g)$ and $\bar{\kappa}(g)$ are anti-symmetric and the matrix $\sigma(g)$ is related to $\rho(g)$ through

$$\sigma(g) = \rho^\dagger(g) - 1. \quad (56)$$

So far all the expressions still depend on the HFB coefficients U and V . Using the definitions for the densities ρ and κ , we now rewrite expressions for the overlaps entirely in terms of these quantities as

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Phi | \hat{R}(g) | \Phi \rangle &= \pm \sqrt{\det D_g} \sqrt{\det(U^T D_g^* U^* + V^T D_g^* V^*)} \\ &= \pm \sqrt{\det D_g} \sqrt{\det\{V^{-1}(V U^\dagger D_g^\dagger U V^\dagger + V V^\dagger D_g^T V V^\dagger)(V^\dagger)^{-1}\}} \\ &= \pm \sqrt{\det D_g} (\det \rho)^{-1/2} \sqrt{\det(\rho D_g \rho - \kappa D_g^* \kappa^*)}, \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

$$= \pm \frac{\det D_g}{\sqrt{\det \rho \det C_g}}, \quad (58)$$

where we have introduced the rotated-densities

$$\rho_g = D_g \rho D_g^\dagger, \quad \rho_{-g} = D_g^\dagger \rho D_g, \quad (59)$$

$$\kappa_g = D_g \kappa D_g^T, \quad \kappa_{-g} = D_g^\dagger \kappa D_g^*, \quad (60)$$

$$Z_g = D_g Z D_g^T, \quad Z_{-g} = D_g^\dagger Z D_g^* \quad (61)$$

and

$$C_g^{-1} = \rho\rho_g - \kappa\kappa_g^*. \quad (62)$$

The transition densities appearing in the Hamiltonian-overlaps can also be rewritten in terms of the HFB densities as

$$\rho(g) = \rho_g C_g \rho, \quad (63)$$

$$\kappa(g) = \rho_g C_g \kappa, \quad (64)$$

$$\bar{\kappa}^*(g) = \kappa_g^* C_g \rho, \quad (65)$$

$$\sigma^*(g) = \kappa_g^* C_g \kappa. \quad (66)$$

It is now clear from the above expressions that the norm- and the Hamiltonian-overlaps are completely expressible in terms of densities ρ and κ . In the next section, it will be shown that the variation of an arbitrary real energy functional which is expressible in terms of these densities results in the HFB equations.

5 Variational Equations

We have now expressed the projected-energy as a functional of the HFB-densities ρ and κ . So far we have used the fact that ρ is hermitian and that κ is skew-symmetric, but we have not used the relations $\mathcal{R}^2 = \mathcal{R}$ ($\rho - \rho^2 = -\kappa\kappa^*$ and $\rho\kappa = \kappa\rho^*$). Without these equations we have the independent variables $\Re(\rho_{n'n})$, $\Im(\rho_{n'n})$, ρ_{nn} , $\Re(\kappa_{n'n})$, and $\Im(\kappa_{n'n})$ for $n < n'$ and we have to vary with respect to them under the constraint $\mathcal{R}^2 = \mathcal{R}$. As shown in standard text books, this variation can be replaced by a variation with respect to the independent variables $\rho_{n'n}$, $\rho_{n'n}^*$, ρ_{nn} , $\kappa_{n'n}$, and $\kappa_{n'n}^*$ for $n < n'$ under the constraint, $\mathcal{R}^2 = \mathcal{R}$. Introducing the Lagrangian multipliers $\Lambda_{nn'}$ the variational ansatz is

$$\delta \left\{ E(\rho, \kappa) - \text{Tr} \left(\Lambda (\mathcal{R}^2 - \mathcal{R}) \right) \right\} = 0. \quad (67)$$

As we have shown in the earlier section that the projected-energy depends only on ρ and κ , the variation of the energy is expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \delta E = & \sum_{n < n'} \left(\frac{\partial E}{\partial \rho_{n'n}} \delta \rho_{n'n} + \frac{\partial E}{\partial \rho_{n'n}^*} \delta \rho_{n'n}^* + \frac{\partial E}{\partial \kappa_{n'n}} \delta \kappa_{n'n} + \frac{\partial E}{\partial \kappa_{n'n}^*} \delta \kappa_{n'n}^* \right) \\ & + \sum_n \frac{\partial E}{\partial \rho_{nn}} \delta \rho_{nn}, \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

and introducing the quantities

$$h_{nn'} = \frac{\partial E}{\partial \rho_{n'n}} \quad \text{for } n \leq n', \quad \Delta_{nn'} = -\frac{\partial E}{\partial \kappa_{n'n}^*} \quad \text{for } n < n'. \quad (69)$$

Since the functional E is real, we find

$$h_{nn'}^* = \frac{\partial E}{\partial \rho_{n'n}^*}, \quad \Delta_{nn'}^* = -\frac{\partial E}{\partial \kappa_{n'n}}. \quad (70)$$

It can be easily shown that

$$h_{nn'} = h_{n'n}^*, \quad \Delta_{nn'} = -\Delta_{n'n}, \quad (71)$$

and obtain

$$\delta E = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \sum_{nn'} \frac{\partial E}{\partial \rho_{n'n}} \delta \rho_{n'n} + \frac{\partial E}{\partial \rho_{n'n}^*} \delta \rho_{n'n}^* + \frac{\partial E}{\partial \kappa_{n'n}} \delta \kappa_{n'n} + \frac{\partial E}{\partial \kappa_{n'n}^*} \delta \kappa_{n'n}^* \right\}, \quad (72)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \sum_{nn'} h_{nn'} \delta \rho_{n'n} + h_{nn'}^* \delta \rho_{n'n}^* - \Delta_{nn'}^* \delta \kappa_{n'n} - \Delta_{nn'} \delta \kappa_{n'n}^* \right\}, \quad (73)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \{ \text{Tr} (h \delta \rho) + \text{Tr} (h^* \delta \rho^*) - \text{Tr} (\Delta^* \delta \kappa) - \text{Tr} (\Delta \delta \kappa^*) \}, \quad (74)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} h & \Delta \\ -\Delta^* & -h^* \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \delta \rho & \delta \kappa \\ -\delta \kappa^* & -\delta \rho^* \end{pmatrix} \right\}, \quad (75)$$

and introducing the matrix

$$\mathcal{H} = \begin{pmatrix} h & \Delta \\ -\Delta^* & -h^* \end{pmatrix}, \quad (76)$$

we have

$$\delta E = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} (\mathcal{H} \delta \mathcal{R}). \quad (77)$$

Including the constraint leads to the variational ansatz

$$\delta \{ E(\rho, \kappa) - \text{Tr} (\Lambda (\mathcal{R}^2 - \mathcal{R})) \} = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \{ (\mathcal{H} - \Lambda \mathcal{R} - \mathcal{R} \Lambda + \Lambda) \delta \mathcal{R} \} = 0. \quad (78)$$

Since $\delta\mathcal{R}$ is an arbitrary variation, we find

$$\mathcal{H} - \Lambda\mathcal{R} - \mathcal{R}\Lambda + \Lambda = 0. \quad (79)$$

Using $(\mathcal{R}^2 - \mathcal{R})$, the above equation can be written as

$$[\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{R}] = 0, \quad (80)$$

which is solved by the HFB-equations

$$\begin{pmatrix} h & \Delta \\ -\Delta^* & -h^* \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} U \\ V \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} U \\ V \end{pmatrix} E. \quad (81)$$

The HFB-equations have been obtained in (81) with the only assumption that the energy functional is expressible in terms of ρ and κ . As we have shown that the projected-energy E^I is also completely expressible in terms of these quantities. Therefore, in the case of variation after projection we find HFB-equations of the same structure. We only have to consider a projected-energy functional

$$E^I = \frac{\langle \Phi | H P^I | \Phi \rangle}{\langle \Phi | P^I | \Phi \rangle} = \int dg y(g) \langle 0 | H | g \rangle, \quad (82)$$

which yields different expressions for the fields h and Δ :

$$h_{nn'}^I = \frac{\partial E^I}{\partial \rho_{n'n}}, \quad \Delta_{nn'}^I = -\frac{\partial E^I}{\partial \kappa_{n'n}^*}. \quad (83)$$

In the following section, these derivatives are obtained for the case of particle-number projection. The expressions of these derivatives in a general case become quite complicated and will not be presented here.

6 Projection of Particle-Number

Number-projection is a simple example of the projection theory since in this case the matrix D_g is just a phase factor, a multiple of a unit matrix. The projection operator which projects out the good particle number (N) is of the form

$$P^N = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int d\phi e^{i\phi(\hat{N}-N)}. \quad (84)$$

The rotation in the gauge-space is given by

$$D_\phi = e^{i\phi}. \quad (85)$$

Using this definition in Eqs. (59) and (60), we obtain the expressions for the rotated-densities in the case of particle-number projection as

$$\rho_\phi = \rho, \quad \kappa_\phi = e^{2i\phi} \kappa. \quad (86)$$

This simplifies the expressions for all the matrices defined in section IV. In particular, we have

$$C_\phi^{-1} \equiv \rho \rho_\phi - \kappa \kappa_\phi^* = e^{-i\phi} \rho \left(e^{i\phi} \rho + e^{-i\phi} (1 - \rho) \right) = \rho C^{-1}(\phi) \quad (87)$$

with

$$C(\phi) = \rho^{-1} C_\phi = \left(\rho + e^{-2i\phi} (1 - \rho) \right)^{-1} \quad (88)$$

$$= e^{2i\phi} \left(1 + \rho (e^{2i\phi} - 1) \right)^{-1} \quad (89)$$

and

$$C^\dagger(\phi) = C(-\phi). \quad (90)$$

For the transition densities we obtain

$$\rho(\phi) = C(\phi) \rho, \quad (91)$$

$$\kappa(\phi) = C(\phi) \kappa = \kappa C^T(\phi), \quad (92)$$

$$\bar{\kappa}(\phi) = e^{2i\phi} \kappa C^*(\phi) = e^{2i\phi} C^\dagger(\phi) \kappa, \quad (93)$$

and

$$\rho(-\phi) = C^\dagger(\phi) \rho = \rho^\dagger(\phi), \quad (94)$$

$$\kappa(-\phi) = e^{-2i\phi} \bar{\kappa}(\phi) = C^\dagger(\phi) \kappa = \kappa C^*(\phi), \quad (95)$$

$$\bar{\kappa}(-\phi) = e^{-2i\phi} \kappa(\phi) = e^{-2i\phi} \kappa C^T(\phi) = e^{-2i\phi} C(\phi) \kappa \quad (96)$$

Considering that $\det D_\phi = e^{iM\phi}$, we find for the norm-overlap

$$x(\phi) = \frac{1}{2\pi} e^{-i\phi N} \sqrt{\det(e^{2i\phi} \rho + (1 - \rho))} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{e^{i\phi(M-N)}}{\sqrt{\det C(\phi)}}. \quad (97)$$

For the Hamiltonian-overlap, we have

$$H_{sp}(\phi) = \text{Tr} (e\rho(\phi)), \quad (98)$$

$$H_{ph}(\phi) = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} (\Gamma(\phi)\rho(\phi)) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n_1 n_2 n_3 n_4} (\rho(\phi))_{n_3 n_1} \bar{v}_{n_1 n_2 n_3 n_4} (\rho(\phi))_{n_4 n_2}, \quad (99)$$

$$H_{pp}(\phi) = -\frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} (\bar{\Delta}^*(\phi)\kappa(\phi)) = -\frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} (\Delta(\phi)\bar{\kappa}^*(\phi)), \quad (100)$$

$$= \frac{1}{4} \sum_{n_1 n_2 n_3 n_4} \bar{\kappa}_{n_1 n_2}^*(\phi) \bar{v}_{n_1 n_2 n_3 n_4} \kappa_{n_3 n_4}(\phi), \quad (101)$$

with

$$\Gamma_{n_1 n_3}(\phi) = \sum_{n_2 n_4} \bar{v}_{n_1 n_2 n_3 n_4} \rho_{n_4 n_2}(\phi), \quad (102)$$

$$\Delta_{n_1 n_2}(\phi) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n_3 n_4} \bar{v}_{n_1 n_2 n_3 n_4} \kappa_{n_3 n_4}(\phi), \quad (103)$$

$$\bar{\Delta}_{n_3 n_4}^*(\phi) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n_1 n_2} \bar{\kappa}_{n_1 n_2}^*(\phi) \bar{v}_{n_1 n_2 n_3 n_4}, \quad (104)$$

with

$$\Gamma(-\phi) = \Gamma^\dagger(\phi), \quad (105)$$

$$\Delta(-\phi) = e^{-2i\phi} \bar{\Delta}(\phi), \quad (106)$$

$$\bar{\Delta}(-\phi) = e^{-2i\phi} \Delta(\phi). \quad (107)$$

Summarizing, we can write the projected-energy as

$$E^N = \int d\phi y(\phi) (H_{sp}(\phi) + H_{ph}(\phi) + H_{pp}(\phi)). \quad (108)$$

In the following subsections, we shall evaluate the variation of the norm- and the Hamiltonian-overlaps.

6.1 Variation of the Norm

Using (14), the norm in the case of the particle-number projection can be rewritten in terms of the density (ρ) only. This simplifies the variational equations considerably. Defining the matrices $X(\phi)$ and $Y(\phi)$ by

$$\frac{\partial x(\phi)}{\partial \rho_{n'n}} = x(\phi) X_{nn'}(\phi), \quad (109)$$

$$\frac{\partial y(\phi)}{\partial \rho_{n'n}} = y(\phi) Y_{nn'}(\phi), \quad (110)$$

we find by differentiation

$$\frac{\partial x(\phi)}{\partial \rho_{n'n}} = \frac{1}{2} x(\phi) \text{Tr} \left(C(\phi) \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho_{n'n}} C^{-1}(\phi) \right), \quad (111)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} x(\phi) (1 - e^{-2i\phi}) C_{nn'}(\phi) = x(\phi) i e^{-i\phi} \sin \phi C_{nn'}(\phi), \quad (112)$$

and obtain

$$X(\phi) = i e^{-i\phi} \sin \phi C(\phi), \quad (113)$$

and

$$Y(\phi) = i e^{-i\phi} \sin \phi C(\phi) - i \int d\phi' y(\phi') e^{-i\phi'} \sin \phi' C(\phi'). \quad (114)$$

6.2 The Projected Hartree-Fock Field

The HF-field in the projected HFB-equations is obtained as the derivative of the number-projected energy with respect to the density

$$h_{nn'}^N = \frac{\partial E^N}{\partial \rho_{n'n}} \quad (115)$$

$$= \int d\phi y(\phi) \left(Y_{nn'}(\phi) H(\phi) + \frac{\partial H(\phi)}{\partial \rho_{n'n}} \right) \quad \text{for } (n \leq n'), \quad (116)$$

which gives

$$h^N = \frac{\partial E^N}{\partial \rho} = \int d\phi y(\phi) Y(\phi) (H_{sp}(\phi) + H_{ph}(\phi) + H_{pp}(\phi)) \quad (117)$$

$$+ \int d\phi y(\phi) \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} (H_{sp}(\phi) + H_{ph}(\phi) + H_{pp}(\phi)). \quad (118)$$

The above projected HF-potential has three parts

$$h^N = \varepsilon^N + \Gamma^N + \Lambda^N \quad (119)$$

with

$$\varepsilon^N = \int d\phi y(\phi) \left(Y(\phi) H_{sp}(\phi) + \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} H_{sp}(\phi) \right), \quad (120)$$

$$\Gamma^N = \int d\phi y(\phi) \left(Y(\phi) H_{ph}(\phi) + \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} H_{ph}(\phi) \right), \quad (121)$$

$$\Lambda^N = \int d\phi y(\phi) \left(Y(\phi) H_{pp}(\phi) + \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} H_{pp}(\phi) \right). \quad (122)$$

Using

$$\text{Tr} \left(A \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho_{n'n}} C(\phi) \right) = -2ie^{-i\phi} \sin \phi (C(\phi) A C(\phi))_{nn'}, \quad (123)$$

we find

$$\frac{\partial H_{sp}(\phi)}{\partial \rho_{n'n}} = \text{Tr} \left(e \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho_{n'n}} [C(\phi) \rho] \right) \quad \text{for } (n \leq n') \quad (124)$$

$$= ([1 - 2ie^{-i\phi} \sin \phi \rho(\phi)] e C(\phi))_{nn'}, \quad (125)$$

$$\frac{\partial H_{ph}(\phi)}{\partial \rho_{n'n}} = \text{Tr} \left(\Gamma(\phi) \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho_{n'n}} [C(\phi) \rho] \right) \quad \text{for } (n \leq n') \quad (126)$$

$$= ([1 - 2ie^{-i\phi} \sin \phi \rho(\phi)] \Gamma(\phi) C(\phi))_{nn'}, \quad (127)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial H_{pp}(\phi)}{\partial \rho_{n'n}} &= -\frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left(\bar{\Delta}^*(\phi) \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho_{n'n}} [C(\phi) \kappa] \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} e^{-2i\phi} \text{Tr} \left(\Delta(\phi) \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho_{n'n}} [\kappa^* C] \right) \quad \text{for } (n \leq n') \end{aligned} \quad (128)$$

$$= ie^{-i\phi} \sin \phi (\kappa(\phi) \bar{\Delta}^*(\phi) C(\phi) + C(\phi) \Delta(\phi) \bar{\kappa}^*(\phi))_{nn'}. \quad (129)$$

Considering Hermiticity, we finally have

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon^N &= \frac{1}{2} \int d\phi y(\phi) \left(Y(\phi) \text{Tr}[e\rho(\phi)] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + [1 - 2ie^{-i\phi} \sin \phi \rho(\phi)] e C(\phi) \right) + h.c. \end{aligned} \quad (130)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma^N &= \frac{1}{2} \int d\phi y(\phi) \left(Y(\phi) \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}[\Gamma(\phi) \rho(\phi)] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} [1 - 2ie^{-i\phi} \sin \phi \rho(\phi)] \Gamma(\phi) C(\phi) \right) + h.c. \end{aligned} \quad (131)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda^N &= -\frac{1}{2} \int d\phi y(\phi) \left(Y(\phi) \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}[\Delta(\phi) \bar{\kappa}^*(\phi)] \right. \\ &\quad \left. - 2ie^{-i\phi} \sin \phi C(\phi) \Delta(\phi) \bar{\kappa}^*(\phi) \right) + h.c. \end{aligned} \quad (132)$$

6.2.1 The Projected-Pair Field

The pairing-field is obtained by variation of the projected-energy with respect to κ

$$\Delta_{nn'}^N = -\frac{\partial E^N}{\partial \kappa_{n'n}^*} \quad \text{for } (n < n') \quad (133)$$

$$= -\int d\phi y(\phi) \frac{\partial H(\phi)}{\partial \kappa_{n'n}^*}. \quad (134)$$

We find

$$\frac{\partial H_{pp}(\phi)}{\partial \kappa_{n'n}^*} = -\frac{1}{2} e^{-2i\phi} \text{Tr} \left(C(\phi) \Delta(\phi) \frac{\partial}{\partial \kappa_{n'n}^*} \kappa^* \right) \quad \text{for } (n < n') \quad (135)$$

$$= -\frac{1}{2} e^{-2i\phi} \left(C(\phi) \Delta(\phi) - (..)^T \right)_{nn'}, \quad (136)$$

which finally yields the pairing-field in the projected HFB-equations

$$\Delta^N = \frac{1}{2} \int d\phi e^{-2i\phi} y(\phi) C(\phi) \Delta(\phi) - (..)^T \quad (137)$$

7 Canonical representation

In this section, we shall demonstrate that the projected expression for the Δ -matrix given in the last section reduces to the familiar form in the canonical basis. In the canonical basis, which we shall denote by the greek indices $(\mu, \nu, \dots)$, the density-matrix and the pairing-tensor reduce to the following (2×2) matrices

$$\rho_\mu = \begin{pmatrix} v_\mu^2 & 0 \\ 0 & v_\mu^2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \kappa_\mu = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & u_\mu v_\mu \\ -u_\mu v_\mu & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Using these basic expressions, the matrices in the number-projection, Eqs. (89-92) acquire the following form in the canonical basis

$$C_\mu(\phi) = \frac{1}{u_\mu^2 + e^{2i\phi} v_\mu^2} = \frac{1}{u_\mu^2 + \zeta v_\mu^2} \quad (138)$$

$$x(\phi) = \frac{e^{-iN\phi}}{2\pi} \prod_{\mu>0} (u_\mu^2 + e^{2i\phi} v_\mu^2) \quad (139)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2\pi} \zeta^{-n} \prod_{\mu>0} (u_\mu^2 + \zeta v_\mu^2) \quad (140)$$

$$\rho_\mu(\phi) = e^{i\phi} C_\mu(\phi) v_\mu^2 \times I \quad (141)$$

$$\kappa_\mu(\phi) = e^{i\phi} C_\mu(\phi) u_\mu v_\mu \times \mathcal{I} \quad (142)$$

$$\bar{\kappa}_\mu^*(\phi) = e^{-i\phi} C_\mu(\phi) u_\mu v_\mu \times \mathcal{I}, \quad (143)$$

where $\zeta = e^{2i\phi}$ and

$$I = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{I} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (144)$$

The norm is therefore given by

$$\langle \Phi | P^N | \Phi \rangle = \int_0^{2\pi} d\phi x(\phi) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint d\zeta \zeta^{-n-1} \prod_{\mu>0} (u_\mu^2 + \zeta v_\mu^2) = R_0^0, \quad (145)$$

where the residuum integrals are defined in analogy to ref. [12]:

$$R_n^m(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint d\zeta \zeta^{m-n-1} \prod_{\mu \neq \mu_1 \dots \mu_m} (u_\mu^2 + \zeta v_\mu^2). \quad (146)$$

Using the expression for the pair-gap (137) and the canonical forms of the matrices in (138-143), we obtain

$$\Delta_{\mu\bar{\mu}'} = \frac{1}{8\pi i} \frac{1}{\langle \Phi_0 | P^N | \Phi_0 \rangle} \times \quad (147)$$

$$\oint d\zeta \zeta^{-N} \sum_{\nu} \langle \mu\bar{\mu}' | v | \nu\bar{\nu} \rangle \frac{\prod_{\nu'} (\zeta^* u_{\nu'}^2 + \zeta v_{\nu'}^2)}{(\zeta^* u_\mu^2 + \zeta v_\mu^2)(\zeta^* u_\nu^2 + \zeta v_\nu^2)} - (\mu \leftrightarrow \mu') \quad (148)$$

The diagonal form ($\mu = \mu'$) of this expression agrees with the expression derived in ref.[12]. The expressions for the other fields in the canonical representation also agree with the expressions given in ref.[12].

8 Model study

As a case study for the projection formalism developed in the present work, we use the deformed shell model Hamiltonian which consists of a deformed

one-body term, h and a scalar two-body delta-interaction [19]. The one-body term is the familiar Nilsson mean-field potential which takes into account of the long-range part of the nucleon-nucleon interaction. The residual short-range interaction is specified by the delta-interaction. The model Hamiltonian employed is given by

$$H = -4\kappa\sqrt{\frac{4\pi}{5}}Y_{20} - g\delta(\hat{r}_1 - \hat{r}_2). \quad (149)$$

We use $G = g \int R_{nl}^4 r^2 dr$ as our energy unit and the deformation energy κ is related to the deformation parameter β . For the case of $h_{11/2}$ shell, $\kappa=2.4$ approximately corresponds to $\beta = 0.25$. The model Hamiltonian has been solved exactly for particles in $h_{11/2}$ intruder subshell and the results will be compared with those obtained using the projection formalism. In the numerical calculations, we have used only $J = 0$ and 2 components of the δ -interaction. The problem with using the full δ -interaction is that in the HFB analysis of this simple model, the contribution of the higher-multipoles to the particle-hole channel is quite large and it renormalises the one-body potential substantially. This renormalization makes it very difficult to choose a reasonable initial HFB fields. In most of the mean-field analysis this particle-hole channel is not considered. However, since we are comparing the results with the exact calculations, it is important to keep all the components of the mean-field. Nevertheless, the main purpose here is to choose a simple model which can be solved exactly and the projection method will be tested using these exact results.

In the HFB analysis of the single- j shell, the single-particle basis are the magnetic-states of the single-particle angular-momentum, j . The summation indices in all the expressions given in section VI run over these magnetic-states. For the case of $h_{11/2}$ orbital, the summation indices have the range $(-11/2, \dots, 11/2)$ and since the Hamiltonian in (149) obeys the time-reversal symmetry, it is required to have only +ive or -ive magnetic-states. Therefore, the summation indices have dimensions of six for the $h_{11/2}$ orbital.

In order to test the projection method, we have performed HFB, PHFB and the exact shell model calculations as a function of the pairing strength, G for 6-particles in $h_{11/2}$. In Fig. 1, the results of total energy (E_{tot}) and pairing energy (E_{pair}) are presented. In PHFB we have used six-mesh points for integration over the gauge-angle. It is found that for the value of G close to 1, the three mesh-points give quite accurate results. However, for the limiting value of G close to 0, it is important to use six-mesh points. The PHFB results of E_{tot} with six-mesh points reproduce the shell model results almost exactly. In Fig. 1 the results of PHFB and the shell model calculations are indistinguishable. As expected the results of PHFB and HFB are identical for $G = 0$ since there is no two-body interaction and E_{tot} is equal to the energy of the one-body

static-potential. The results of PHFB and HFB deviate with increasing value of G and the deviation is more than 1 unit for the value of $G = 1$. The results of E_{pair} are shown in the lower pannel of Fig. 1 and it is clear that HFB shows a phase transition at $G = 0.4$. For $G = 0.4$ and lower, E_{pair} is exactly zero. The PHFB on the other hand depicts no such phase transition and has a finite value for finite G .

9 Summary

In order to obtain an approximate solution of the many-body problem, it is often required to break the symmetries which the original many-body Hamiltonian obeys. For instance, in the case of Hartree-Fock or Hartree-Fock-Bogoliubov approaches, the many-body wavefunction is approximated by a Slater-determinant which in a general case breaks the rotational and the particle-number symmetries. In order to have a better description for the many-body problem, it is essential to restore the broken-symmetries.

The symmetry restoration may not be very critical in strongly symmetry breaking conditions, but for the case of a weakly broken symmetry the restoration is quite important. For example, in the case of well deformed nuclei in the ground state, the pair-correlations are strong and the BCS theory which breaks the particle-number symmetry, describes the pair-correlation quite reasonably. However, with increasing quasiparticle excitation, the pair-correlations reduce and the BCS solution collapses. The pair-correlations are also quenched for superdeformed shapes. For these weak pairing cases, it is quite essential to consider the restoration of the particle-number. As already mentioned in the introduction, the most undesirable feature associated with the mean-field theory is that one obtains unphysical phase transitions, for instance from finite-pairing to zero-pairing. These phase transitions are smeared out with the restoration of the broken symmetries.

In most cases, the projection methods have been carried out approximately [15]. A self-consistent description of the projection in the HFB framework has been an unresolved problem. In the present work, we have obtained the symmetry-projected HFB equations for the first time. This has been possible by first realising that the projected-energy can be completely expressed in terms of the HFB densities and then it has been demonstrated that the variation of an arbitrary energy functional which is completely expressible in terms of HFB densities, results in HFB equations. The expressions for the Hartree-Fock and the pair-field depend on the form of the energy functional. In the case of the HFB energy, the expressions for these fields are quite simple, whereas with the projected-energy the expressions for these quantities are more involved.

We consider that the major advantage with the present projection formalism is that one can use the existing HFB computer codes and the only the expressions for the fields need to be redefined. We have applied the projection method to an exactly soluble deformed single-j shell model with the conclusion that the numerical effort involed is similar to performing the bare HFB calculations. The results of the projection method almost agree completely with the exact shell model calculations and the phase transition obtained in HFB is smeared out with the projection.

10 Appendix: Helpful Formulae

Here, we present some helpful formulae for calculating the derivatives for matrices and matrix functions which have been extensively used in the present work. If $A(x)$ and $B(x)$ are arbitrary matrices depending on a parameter x , we have for $A' = dA/dx$

$$\det(A) = e^{\text{Tr} \ln A}, \quad (150)$$

$$\frac{d}{dx} (AB) = A'B + AB', \quad (151)$$

$$\frac{d}{dx} A^{-1} = -A^{-1} A' A^{-1}, \quad (152)$$

$$\frac{d}{dx} \det(A) = \det A \text{Tr}(A^{-1} A'), \quad (153)$$

$$\frac{d}{dx} \det(A^{-1}) = -(\det A^{-1}) \text{Tr}(A^{-1} A'), \quad (154)$$

$$\frac{d}{dx} \det(AB) = \det(AB) \text{Tr}(A^{-1} A' + B^{-1} B') \quad (155)$$

$$\frac{d}{dx} \det(A^{-1} B) = \det(A^{-1} B) \text{Tr}(-A^{-1} A' + B^{-1} B') \quad (156)$$

References

- [1] D.J. Thouless, *The Quantum Mechanics of Many-Body Systems* (Academic Press, New York, 1972).
- [2] P. Ring and P. Schuck, *The Nuclear Many-Body Problem* (Springer Verlag, New York, 1980).
- [3] H.A. Bethe, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Sci. **21** (1971) 93.
- [4] J. Bardeen, L.N. Cooper and J.R. Schrieffer, Phys. Rev. **108** (1957) 5
- [5] A. Bohr, B.R. Mottelson, and D. Pines, Phys. Rev. **110** (1958) 936
- [6] S.T.Belyaev, Mat. Fys. Medd. **31** (1959) No.11
- [7] N.N. Bogoliubov, Soviet Phys. JETP **34** (1958) 41
- [8] R.E. Peierls and J. Yoccoz, Proc. Phys. Soc. **A70** (1957) 381
- [9] R. Rossignoli and P.Ring, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **235** (1994) 350
- [10] H.D. Zeh, Z. Phys. **202** (1967) 38
- [11] K.W. Schmid and F. Grummer, Rep. Prog. Phys. **50** (1987) 731
- [12] K. Dietrich, H.J. Mang, and J.H. Pradal, Phys. Rev. **135** (1964) B22
- [13] J.L. Egido and P.Ring, Nucl.Phys. **A383** (1982) 189,
- [14] J.L. Egido and P.Ring, Nucl.Phys. **A388** (1982) 19
- [15] H. Flocard and N. Onishi, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **254** (1996) 275
- [16] J.G. Valatin, Phys. Rev. **122** (1961) 1012
- [17] A. Hayashi, K. Hara, and P. Ring, Nucl. Phys. **A385** (1982) 14
- [18] K. Neergård and E. Wüst, Nucl. Phys. **A402** (1983) 311
- [19] J.A. Sheikh, M.A. Nagarajan, N. Rowley and K.F. Pal, Phys. Lett. **B223** (1989)

Fig. 1. The results of the total energy (E_{tot}) and the pair energy (E_{pair}) for six-particles in a deformed $j = 11/2$ orbital using different approaches. The projected-HFB results for E_{tot} are indistinguishable from the exact shell model calculations.

